

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Office Action dated November 1, 2005, claims 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14 and 15 are amended. Claims 1-15 are now active in this application. No new matter has been added.

The amendments to claims 6 and 7 are made so that the preambles correspond to originally filed claims 6 and 7.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

I. Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parulski (USPN 6,072,962) in view of Berstis (USPN 6,721,001).

The Examiner contends that Parulski discloses the features recited in independent claims 1, 8 and 12-15 except for recording specific information including the type of object corresponding to the selected frame which describes what the object is. Berstis is relied upon as disclosing a camera which is capable of adding annotations to an image which include the name of the place depicted, time the picture was taken, the names of persons depicted. The Examiner maintains it would have been obvious to combine this feature of Berstis with the arrangement/method of Parulski to meet the terms of the claims.

The rejection is traversed as to claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9 and 12-14.

Claims 1 requires, *inter alia*:

a memory for storing image data of a plurality of frames representing an ideal region of an object within an image, each frame corresponding to a type of object and including data representing an area corresponding to said ideal region;

a frame selector for selecting a frame from the plurality of frames as a selected frame;

a display device for displaying the selected frame superimposed on a monitor image obtained by an image sensing device;

an image capture device for capturing a image data based on the monitor image; and

a recording device for recording on a recording medium, different from said memory, specific information corresponding to the selected frame and the image data captured by the image capture device associated with each other, said specific information including (i) the type of the object corresponding to the selected frame and (ii) said data representing an area corresponding to said ideal region for the selected frame, wherein

the specific information regarding the type of the object corresponding to the selected frame describes what the object is.

Claims 12 and 13 have steps corresponding to the features recited in claim 1.

The plurality of frames are different from the image data captured by the image capture device. Each frame corresponds to a type of object and includes data representing an area corresponding to an ideal region of an object within an image. What is recorded on the recording medium (different from the memory storing the image data of the plurality of frames), in addition to the captured image data, is specific information corresponding *to the selected frame*, not the captured image data. The specific information regarding the type of the object corresponding to the selected frame describes what the object (included in the photographic image) is. What Berstis discloses is storing information regarding the captured image data, not a (separately) selected frame (of image data) representing an ideal region of an object within an image. Thus, if the teaching of Berstis were applied to the arrangement/method of Parulski, information regarding the captured image data would be stored corresponding to the captured image data, not specific information corresponding to a *selected frame* with the specific information corresponding to the selected frame describing what the object is.

Thus, the claimed invention does not result if the teaching of Berstis were applied to the arrangement/method of Parulski. Consequently, the allowance of independent claims 1, 12 and 13, as well as dependent claims 2-4 and 6 is respectfully solicited.

To expedite prosecution, independent claim 8 is amended to recite, *inter alia*:

the photographic image corrector corrects the image data in the object area in which the photographic object is arranged by using a specific correction parameter corresponding to what the object arranged in the object area is.

In addition, independent claim 14 is amended to recite, *inter alia*:

... correcting the image data includes correcting the object area data in which the object is arranged by changing previously stored standard correction parameters for correcting the entire image data to specific correction parameters stored corresponding to what the object arranged in the object area data is.

Parulski discloses that there are one or more image modification states associated with each area designated by the area designator. However, there is nothing in Parulski that describes that any of these image modification states (non-modifying and modifying) modify an image by changing previously stored standard modifying parameters for modifying the entire image data to specific modification parameters stored corresponding to what the object arranged in the object area data is.

Consequently amended independent claims 8 and 14, as well as dependent claim 9 are patentable over Parulski and Berstis, and their allowance is respectfully solicited.

II. Claims 5, 7, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parulski (USPN 6,072,962) in view of Berstis (USPN 6,721,001), and further in view of Iijima et al. (USPN 6,621,524).

To expedite prosecution, claim 10 is amended to depend from independent claim 1, as well as to be consistent with claim 1. Claim 11 is amended to be consistent with claim 1 also. In addition, independent claim 15 is amended to include the features of claims 1 and amended claim 10 in step form.

As independent claim 1 is patentable over Parulski and Berstis, claims 5, 7, 10 and 11 depending directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, as well as amended independent claim 15 are patentable over Parulski and Berstis also, even when considered in view of Iijima et al. Consequently, the allowance of claims 5, 7, 10, 11 and 15, as amended, is respectfully solicited.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is urged that the application, as now amended, is in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Edward J. Wise
Registration No. 34,523

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 EJW:cac
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: February 1, 2006

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**